

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF :

CITY OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS,

Petitioner,

V

No. T08-0128

NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILROAD, NORTHERN)
INDIANA COMMUTER TRANSPORTATION)
DISTRICT and THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT)
OF TRANSPORTATION,)

Respondents .

Petition to create grade separation)
crossings and to close at-grade)
crossings at 130th Street and)
Torrence Avenue, through the)
reconstruction of 130th Street,)
Brainard Avenue and Torrence Avenue,)
impacting the tracks of Norfolk)
Southern and the Northern Indiana)
Commuter Transportation District/)
Illinois Indiana Development)
Corporation and other relief, in)
Cook County, Illinois.)

Chicago, Illinois

April 2, 2009

Met pursuant to notice at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE :

MR. DEAN JACKSON, Administrative Law Judge.

1

2 APPEARANCES:

3 MR. JACK A. PACE
30 North LaSalle Street, Room 900
4 Chicago, Illinois 60602
appeared for the City of Chicago,
5 Petitioner;

6

MR. NEIL F. FLYNN
7 1035 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois 62704
8 appeared for Norfolk Southern
Railroad, Respondent, telephonically;

9

10 MR. ZUBAIR HAIDER
201 West Center Court
11 Schaumburg, Illinois 60196
appeared for IDOT, Respondent;

12

13 MR. BRIAN VERCRUYSSSE
527 East Capitol Avenue
14 Springfield, Illinois 62701
appeared for Staff.

15

16 ALSO PRESENT:

MR. SOLIMAN KHUDEIRA
17 City of Chicago, Department
of Transportation

18

19

20

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
21 Teresann B. Giorgi, CSR

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

I N D E X

Witnesses:

Dir.

Crx.

Re-
dir.

Re-
crx.

By
Examiner

NONE

E X H I B I T S

APPLICANT'S

FOR IDENTIFICATION

IN EVIDENCE

1 JUDGE JACKSON: Pursuant to the authority vested
2 in me by the Illinois Commerce Commission and the
3 State of Illinois, I will call Docket No. T08-0128
4 for hearing. This is the Petition filed by the City
5 of Chicago that involves Norfolk Southern Railroad,
6 Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District
7 and the Illinois Department of Transportation.

8 Appearances, please.

9 City.

10 MR. PACE: On behalf of the City of Chicago,
11 Jack Pace, spelled P-a-c-e, 30 North LaSalle Street,
12 Suite 900, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

13 And with me today is Mr. Soliman
14 Khudeira, the project manager for this project.

15 JUDGE JACKSON: Thank you.

16 Norfolk Southern Railroad.

17 MR. FLYNN: For the record, my name is Neil F.
18 Flynn, my business address is 1035 South Second
19 Street, Springfield, Illinois 62704. I am appearing
20 as the attorney of record in this matter for
21 Respondent, Norfolk Southern Railroad Company.

22 JUDGE JACKSON: Do we have anyone from Northern

1 Indiana? I wouldn't think.

2 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: No, your Honor.

3 MR. PACE: No, your Honor.

4 JUDGE JACKSON: They've already filed a pleading
5 in the case, although haven't really been with us.

6 But they do know if they have any problems they can
7 come join us. They get notices.

8 IDOT, please.

9 MR. HAIDER: Zubair Haider, H-a-i-d-e-r, from
10 IDOT District I, business address is 201 West Center
11 Court, Schaumburg, Illinois 60196.

12 JUDGE JACKSON: Mr. Vercruysse.

13 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Thank you, your Honor.

14 Appearing for Staff of the Illinois
15 Commerce Commission, Brian Vercruysse with address
16 at 527 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois
17 62701, phone number, 312-636-7760. Thank you.

18 JUDGE JACKSON: Thank you.

19 We were last physically together in
20 this case December 2nd, 2008. At that time and
21 since then, the parties have been working on
22 exchanging construction and other agreements,

1 working on specifics as to project costs and I
2 thought maybe even working on a proposed interim
3 order or a final order, whichever the case might be.

4 We've continued the case a couple of
5 times since December 2008, to allow the parties
6 additional time to work on these matters.

7 Where are we today?

8 Mr. Pace?

9 MR. PACE: I'm going to defer to Mr. Vercruysse
10 at this point, then I will follow up.

11 JUDGE JACKSON: All right. Very good.

12 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Thank you, your Honor.

13 For the record I'll note my appearance
14 as Staff --

15 JUDGE JACKSON: Oh, I'm sorry, I forgot Staff.

16 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: That's okay. I wasn't sure if
17 you were going to have Mr. Harpering and Mr. Johnson
18 in there.

19 Representing the Illinois Commerce
20 Commission Staff, Brian Vercruysse,
21 V-e-r-c-r-u-y-s-s-e, with business address at
22 527 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois

1 62701, 312-636-7760 is the phone number. And thank
2 you.

3 Your Honor, we have had a proposed
4 order that had circulated around to the parties and
5 it was drafted at a time when we still had a few
6 remaining issues, one being the proposal for leaving
7 an at-grade crossing in place north of 130th Street.
8 Since that time it has been resolved that that
9 crossing is not necessary and a different access
10 point was arrived at for maintenance in the
11 northwest quadrant of 130th and Torrence.

12 There were issues remaining as far as
13 the Norfolk Southern participation in the project
14 relative to removing the at-grade crossings and
15 building the bridges.

16 And then there was also an issue
17 relative to matching funds and how the last part of
18 the financial package would take place between the
19 Illinois Department of Transportation and the City
20 of Chicago.

21 It seems that each of these last items
22 has been resolved and I'll turn them over,

1 respectively, to Mr. Flynn and Mr. Pace and
2 Mr. Haider. And we'll be prepared to modify the
3 order that had already been done to account for
4 these and send it around to all the parties
5 including NICT-D, the Northern Indiana Commuter
6 Transportation District, and hopefully we'll be in a
7 position to move towards an order.

8 So Mr. Flynn or Mr. Pace, if you would
9 like to fill in or provide your clients.

10 MR. PACE: Well, I'm not sure if you want to
11 start with the Railroad's issues or maybe the IDOT
12 issue. Do you have a preference, your Honor?

13 JUDGE JACKSON: No, whichever you prefer.

14 MR. PACE: Well, why don't we start with the
15 IDOT issue, if that's all right.

16 JUDGE JACKSON: Sure.

17 MR. PACE: We have -- certainly CDOT and IDOT
18 have been working to resolve the matching fund issue
19 and we've developed some language that we've
20 submitted to Mr. Vercruysse that came out of those
21 discussions and it's acceptable to the Staff and
22 that is that at this time we -- the parties are

1 continuing to work on the issue, but they believe
2 that it will be resolved and that they would like to
3 go forward with the project.

4 Specifically, the language that we're
5 discussing is as follows: The City of Chicago and
6 the State of Illinois are working to establish and
7 coordinate the fiscal year 2009 matching funds for
8 this project, a relatively small amount of the
9 overall budget, and believe that the issue will
10 ultimately be resolved.

11 If Mr. Zubair (sic) would like to
12 comment on that, I would like him to do that at this
13 point.

14 MR. HAIDER: In general, City does their own
15 programming. They have substantial amount
16 programmed. And at this time, so far as matching is
17 concerned, the State is not committed, that I know
18 of.

19 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, could you repeat that.

20 MR. HAIDER: What I'm saying is, City does their
21 own programming, so funds can be moved on their own
22 in general. So far, you know, this language seems

1 okay to us. I just want to say that this doesn't
2 mean that State is committed to the matching as far
3 I know at this time.

4 MR. PACE: And the City understands that
5 position at this time.

6 JUDGE JACKSON: All right.

7 Just ballpark figure of -- the total
8 project cost is around 157 million. How much are we
9 talking about is in the cost-sharing issue between
10 the City and IDOT?

11 MR. KHUDEIRA: The match amount -- the total
12 dollar amount of the match is around \$14 million.

13 JUDGE JACKSON: 14 million.

14 MR. KHUDEIRA: The total project budget is about
15 \$138 million out of which 14 million is needed to be
16 matched. And the remaining is shared funds between
17 Federal, State and City.

18 JUDGE JACKSON: All right.

19 MR. KHUDEIRA: So, your Honor, the amount is
20 14 million -- the match amount is \$14 million.

21 JUDGE JACKSON: The match amount.

22 MR. KHUDEIRA: Yes.

1 JUDGE JACKSON: But you believe you'll be able
2 to work that out.

3 MR. KHUDEIRA: Yes. The City and the State is
4 currently talking about the match issue, not only
5 for this project, but for the match issue in
6 general, and we believe the issue will be resolved.

7 JUDGE JACKSON: If we're still talking 2009
8 dollars, I know what the State's fiscal year is, are
9 we under any gun to get an order out or an interim
10 order, say, before June 1 or by July 1?

11 MR. PACE: Your Honor, yes, we would like to
12 have an order issued as soon as possible.

13 JUDGE JACKSON: All right.

14 Now, will this be an interim order, do
15 you know, or a final order, subject to working out
16 the remaining issues?

17 MR. PACE: Your Honor, I think we're in a
18 position to request a final order.

19 JUDGE JACKSON: Oh, that would be great.

20 MR. PACE: We think that, you know, in addition
21 to the IDOT issue, the remaining rail issues are,
22 from our perspective, 99.9 percent resolved, subject

1 to -- we'll have to, obviously, negotiate and
2 execute formal agreements on each of these terms,
3 but we have the material terms already negotiated.

4 So I believe that we can proceed with
5 the final order.

6 JUDGE JACKSON: Okay.

7 MR. PACE: I was just going to have
8 Mr. Khudeira, if you would like, just briefly, let
9 you know, you know, the amount of funds that have
10 already been expended on this project.

11 JUDGE JACKSON: Sure.

12 MR. PACE: And that, you know, we're talking
13 about just the matching funds for the 2009 fiscal
14 year --

15 JUDGE JACKSON: Right.

16 MR. PACE: -- and that there were previous years
17 that have already been agreed upon.

18 JUDGE JACKSON: All right.

19 MR. KHUDEIRA: The total budget is -- as I
20 mentioned, is 138 million. According to our recent
21 programming -- is 138, 1-3-8. This is the total
22 budget for this project, which is the main contract,

1 the remaining project to be done.

2 MR. FLYNN: I've been operating under -- and
3 maybe there's a change in the Petition, I thought it
4 was 157 million, am I off by 20 million or did I
5 misunderstand you?

6 MR. KHUDEIRA: The 157 million, that's the total
7 program budget. That included construction
8 contracts that's already completed. We have so far
9 completed two construction contracts and we also
10 spent to date more than \$10 million in
11 engineering funds. So if you add all of those
12 expenditures to date, that's the 157 million.

13 MR. FLYNN: So the 138 figure is what's left.

14 MR. KHUDEIRA: Exactly.

15 MR. FLYNN: Thank you.

16 MR. KHUDEIRA: The 138 million is money that we,
17 the City, programmed -- or is in the process of
18 finalizing the program to be able to advertise this
19 final construction package for bidding.

20 And this \$138 million is divided
21 into -- as I mentioned, for which 14 million that
22 needs to be matched, that's a match issue, and then

1 we have 109 million already programmed and
2 committed, according to our numbers, and then
3 there's 15 million to be programmed.

4 So if I may summarize it, 138 million,
5 there's 109 million that the City already
6 programmed, 14 million in match money to be
7 negotiated and agreed between the City and the State
8 and then additional 15 million to be programmed. So
9 if you add 109 plus 15 plus 14, that's where the
10 138 million comes from.

11 And I just want to emphasize that
12 to date we have completed two construction packages.
13 I think they are in excess -- both of them are in
14 excess of 10, \$12 million. We have spent in excess
15 of \$10 million on engineering costs, Phase I and
16 Phase II of the engineering.

17 This last package has to happen. We
18 have no doubt that it's going to happen.

19 JUDGE JACKSON: Thank you.

20 Any other IDOT issues, Mr. Pace?

21 MR. PACE: I don't believe so.

22 JUDGE JACKSON: Okay. Did you want to move on

1 to somebody else's issues?

2 MR. PACE: Yes.

3 As Mr. Vercruysse summarized in
4 terms of the discussions between the City and
5 Norfolk Southern, that has resulted in a resolution
6 of all the material terms for the three outstanding
7 issues. Although I know that, just to digress for a
8 moment -- well, the force account issue still has
9 some work to be done, but that's a relatively small
10 issue.

11 The three major issues were the
12 current public crossing, which originally was
13 discussed to be transformed into a private crossing
14 and there was some ancillary issues with that and
15 that's been resolved because there is an alternative
16 access point that will be created. So that -- my
17 understanding, that crossing will no longer be any
18 type of crossing.

19 MR. KHUDEIRA: That's right.

20 MR. PACE: After the construction project is
21 completed. Of course, there'll be some interim
22 access for construction crews and that. But after

1 the project is completed that crossing will no
2 longer exist.

3 MR. KHUDEIRA: Yes.

4 MR. PACE: And that's agreeable between the
5 parties.

6 The second issue is the percentage
7 contribution by Norfolk Southern to the project, per
8 Federal law, and that amount has been agreed upon
9 and a timetable for expenditures, which Mr. Khudeira
10 could later discuss, has been agreed upon, you know,
11 with certain milestones during the project.

12 And then, again, the final one is the
13 force account issue, and Mr. Khudeira could speak to
14 this as well, but my understanding is that we're
15 very, very close. I mean, we have received, I
16 think, the final numbers from the Railroad. And
17 then we're just looking for some additional backup
18 on a small portion of that, but it's not going to --
19 you know, once we get that backup, you know, that
20 number has been agreed upon.

21 So in our view -- again, these three
22 issues will have to be documented in a formal

1 agreement. But, again, the material terms have been
2 agreed upon.

3 JUDGE JACKSON: Mr. Flynn, do you have anything?

4 MR. FLYNN: Yes, your Honor.

5 Mr. Pace is accurate. And my
6 information was on the 5 percent issue and that has
7 been resolved. And the amount which is in the range
8 of 5.1 million is subject to the formal agreement of
9 that -- that amount for the 5 percent contribution.

10 The separate agreement Mr. Pace made
11 reference to, the force account work, is all but
12 resolved. And my understanding is just some
13 documentation to substantiate -- relatively, a small
14 part is all but finished and that is supposed to be
15 accomplished.

16 So that is correct.

17 JUDGE JACKSON: Great.

18 Next issues, if any?

19 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Your Honor, in terms of Staff's
20 position, I know we had started off -- or I started
21 off with mentioning how I'll revise the order and
22 then we worked backwards through the issues that are

1 near resolution.

2 I'll move forward with drafting the
3 order for all parties, including NICT-D, and once I
4 receive concurrence from each party, I'll provide a
5 filing to you of that proposed agreed order. And it
6 will also include the correspondence from NICT-D as
7 far as their concurrence for the overall project.

8 JUDGE JACKSON: Great.

9 Since this is such a substantial
10 project, I would like to see individual party
11 concurrences, whether Staff files all of them or
12 they're filed individually by the parties, it makes
13 no difference to me so long as they are filed.

14 Are you with me?

15 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

16 JUDGE JACKSON: I was just hoping it made sense.

17 Just as a FYI from the Commission
18 standpoint, the Commission has canceled the early
19 February Bench session that we normally would have
20 had. We have two of them up, generally.

21 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: I'm sorry, your Honor. You
22 said "February," do you mean --

1 JUDGE JACKSON: I'm sorry, did I say "February"
2 I meant April. The first April Bench has been
3 canceled. The next Bench, I believe, is April 22nd
4 or 25th. But then thereafter, we only have two in
5 May, if you want to be done before June. So just
6 keep that in back of your mind when you're
7 circulating and taking your time, you know,
8 reviewing the order, to agree to the substance of
9 the order.

10 And once it gets to me, I can get it
11 done ASAP. All I need to do is redraft it, not for
12 substance, mostly form, since everything is agreed,
13 and write a separate memo for the Commissioners
14 recommending it be entered. I can do that in a day.

15 So just a FYI, they've been known to
16 cancel a Bench here and there. They did it for this
17 month.

18 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Thank you, your Honor.

19 May we ask the City, Mr. Khudeira, as
20 far as what -- do you have a specific target letting
21 or is it --

22 JUDGE JACKSON: That's a good question.

1 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: -- floating versus this order
2 and resolution of the final agreements with the NS
3 and IDOT?

4 MR. KHUDEIRA: Sure.

5 We are trying right now to close all
6 the open issues, certainly the ICC order is one of
7 the issues. And the second issue that's -- is still
8 open is, of course, the funding. So if we have the
9 funding, the match issue resolved and all the
10 funding is online, then we are ready to advertise
11 the project because the plans, specifications is
12 already completed.

13 So let's say if we have funding within
14 a month or two, for example, then the next step is
15 we show to IDOT that the funding is available online
16 and that we ask for the concurrence and they give us
17 a letter authorizing us to advertise the project.
18 And then we advertise the project for public
19 bidding.

20 So I think the biggest issue we have
21 right now is the funding. The funding is available,
22 the ICC order is online, we don't have any major

1 issue to resolve. So we are ready to advertise,
2 provided those issues are resolved.

3 JUDGE JACKSON: Shovel ready --

4 MR. KHUDEIRA: Shovel ready.

5 JUDGE JACKSON: -- as they say.

6 MR. KHUDEIRA: This project has too many
7 shovels, though.

8 MR. FLYNN: Can I say something?

9 JUDGE JACKSON: Sure.

10 MR. FLYNN: I just had a quick question. We
11 resolved this issue of the crossing and there is no
12 crossing at all.

13 The other question I had, just to
14 verify one detail was, will there be any -- there's
15 going to be some relocation, if I understand this
16 project, of some track.

17 MR. KHUDEIRA: Yes.

18 MR. FLYNN: Will there be any temporary
19 crossings during this project and if so, if there's
20 temporary crossings, will there be signalization
21 that will be necessary, and if so, has that been
22 included in and thought about and accounted for?

1 MR. KHUDEIRA: The answer is yes. There are
2 existing crossings, of course. And then during
3 construction those existing crossings there will be
4 signal modifications to accommodate the stages of
5 the construction and that's already coordinated with
6 Norfolk Southern.

7 And then when the new railing is
8 installed there will also be temporary signals at
9 the location of the new rail. And then when the
10 project is completed, of course, all of those will
11 be removed.

12 All of those project staging,
13 temporary signals, already coordinated with
14 Norfolk Southern. And the force account dollar
15 amount includes Norfolk Southern's cost to install,
16 remove, modify the signals.

17 MR. FLYNN: That was my understanding, as well,
18 although, up until this point I realized that detail
19 hadn't been, at least, finalized among those two
20 parties, discussions.

21 So there will be something in the
22 order that will deal with a temporary crossings,

1 obligations, what kind of signalization will be
2 necessary or is that something that is --

3 JUDGE JACKSON: If that's something we want in
4 the order, I'm leaving it up to you and the parties,
5 rather than in a separate agreement. You'll have to
6 hash that out.

7 MR. FLYNN: That's got to be in the order.

8 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Mr. Flynn, and your Honor, we
9 can put something in the order that discusses how
10 the staging is to play out.

11 JUDGE JACKSON: Right.

12 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: That's more what this involves,
13 it's utilizing the existing at-grade crossings and
14 the staging effort so that they still maintain
15 east/west and north/south travel.

16 The issue we can definitely put in
17 there that the construction will utilize the
18 existing at-grade crossings with the necessity that
19 any signal or warning device modifications needs to
20 be coordinated with the City and signal staff and
21 the Staff of the Commission, especially if we have
22 the presence of the traffic signals at the

1 intersection of Torrence with 130th. Those
2 currently are not interconnected. So we have to be
3 very sure that we're not backing up construction
4 traffic into these crossings.

5 And we will work with each party to
6 determine how the staging sets up, how the
7 contractors are working and that needs to be part of
8 the preconstruction hearing and everything else. So
9 we will include that.

10 As far as any other temporary
11 crossings, Mr. Flynn, I don't know that we have a
12 temporary construction access anywhere else other
13 than what we have for the existing public at-grade
14 crossings.

15 Is that correct?

16 MR. KHUDEIRA: That's correct.

17 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: So I will include that.

18 JUDGE JACKSON: I have a hand raised down here
19 in Springfield.

20 MR. HARPERING: Jeff Harpering here with IDOT.

21 Mr. Flynn's questions brought up a
22 point, typically these types of projects we would

1 see a separate agreement between the City and the
2 Railroad to cover that temporary crossing work, any
3 temporary signals, unless you cover it in detail in
4 the order, nine times the order --

5 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm having trouble
6 hearing.

7 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Mr. Harpering, your Honor, our
8 reporter is having a hard time hearing with our
9 connection, I'm sorry.

10 JUDGE JACKSON: You know, we're having problems
11 down here hearing you guys, too.

12 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Sorry about that.

13 MR. Harpering: These temporary crossings --

14 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Can we clarify, again, these
15 will not be temporary crossings per se. They're the
16 existing at-grade crossings that are going to be
17 staged so that it's -- it's just part of the
18 construction plan that's already in the agreement
19 and the construction agreement would be the
20 understanding.

21 MR. FLYNN: What you're saying is, we're not
22 going to relocate them. They're not going to be a

1 temporary crossing at a location where it does not
2 now exist.

3 It will require, for example, the
4 moving of the gates and lights that are there now
5 and then ultimately moved back or taken out when the
6 whole project is finished, is that correct?

7 MR. KHUDEIRA: And all the temporary crossings
8 will be located within the current right-of-way. So
9 in some stages of the project, we will be closing
10 the, let's say, westbound traffic. So in this case,
11 Norfolk Southern will relocate their signals and
12 gates to accommodate the construction stages. But
13 all of that is within the existing crossing as it is
14 today.

15 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: It's a temporary layout for the
16 existing crossings.

17 MR. KHUDEIRA: That's right. Yes.

18 MR. HARPERING: Would there be some separate
19 agreement covering how that would be paid for, you
20 know, how the Railroad would be reimbursed?

21 MR. FLYNN: I believe that is all within the
22 force account work estimate that has been submitted

1 and has been all but resolved between the City of
2 Chicago and Norfolk, is that correct?

3 MR. KHUDEIRA: That's correct.

4 Yes. The force account does include
5 dollar amount for Norfolk Southern to do all of
6 those signals and gates relocation to accommodate
7 the project stages. Yes.

8 MR. FLYNN: Thank you.

9 MR. HARPERING: Okay.

10 JUDGE JACKSON: Very good. Sounds like
11 everybody has been busy doing good work.

12 Anything else to come before us this
13 morning?

14 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Nothing from Staff, your Honor.
15 Thank you.

16 JUDGE JACKSON: Mr. Pace?

17 MR. PACE: No, your Honor.

18 JUDGE JACKSON: Mr. Haider, anything?

19 MR. HAIDER: No, your Honor.

20 JUDGE JACKSON: Do we want to mark the record
21 heard and taken today?

22 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Staff concurs with that and has

1 no objection, your Honor.

2 JUDGE JACKSON: Okay.

3 MR. PACE: No objection.

4 JUDGE JACKSON: The City, no objection.

5 Railroad?

6 MR. FLYNN: No objection, your Honor.

7 JUDGE JACKSON: IDOT?

8 MR. HAIDER: No objection.

9 JUDGE JACKSON: No objection, okay.

10 Just again to restate, the last day

11 for us to submit an order for the following Bench is

12 two weeks before that Bench session. So if you get

13 me something that is going to be looked at by

14 everyone and everyone agrees to it and everyone has

15 filed something to that effect, or Staff has filed

16 that for everyone, if you get that to me two weeks

17 and one day before the Bench session, you will be on

18 the following Bench session.

19 Fair enough?

20 MR. VERCRUYSSSE: Thank you, your Honor.

21 JUDGE JACKSON: Good work, people.

22 Thank you.

1 MR. HAIDER: Thank you.

2 MR. PACE: Thank you.

3 JUDGE JACKSON: The record is marked heard and
4 taken.

5 Thanks, everyone.

6 HEARD AND TAKEN.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22